

University of Groningen

Hierarchical reinforcement learning for real-time strategy games

Niel, Remi; Krebbers, Jasper; Drugan, Madalina M.; Wiering, Marco A.

Published in:
ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence

DOI:
[10.5220/0006593804700477](https://doi.org/10.5220/0006593804700477)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Niel, R., Krebbers, J., Drugan, M. M., & Wiering, M. A. (2018). Hierarchical reinforcement learning for real-time strategy games. In A. P. Rocha, & J. van den Herik (Eds.), *ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 2, pp. 470-477). (ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence; Vol. 2). SciTePress. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0006593804700477>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning for Real-Time Strategy Games

Remi Niel¹, Jasper Krebbers¹, Madalina M. Drugan² and Marco A. Wiering¹

¹*Institute of Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Engineering, University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

²*ITLearns.Online, The Netherlands*

Keywords: Computer Games, Reinforcement Learning, Multi-agent Systems, Multi-layer Perceptrons, Real-Time Strategy Games.

Abstract: Real-Time Strategy (RTS) games can be abstracted to resource allocation applicable in many fields and industries. We consider a simplified custom RTS game focused on mid-level combat using reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms. There are a number of contributions to game playing with RL in this paper. First, we combine hierarchical RL with a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) that receives higher-order inputs for increased learning speed and performance. Second, we compare Q-learning against Monte Carlo learning as reinforcement learning algorithms. Third, because the teams in the RTS game are multi-agent systems, we examine two different methods for assigning rewards to agents. Experiments are performed against two different fixed opponents. The results show that the combination of Q-learning and individual rewards yields the highest win-rate against the different opponents, and is able to defeat the opponent within 26 training games.

1 INTRODUCTION

Games are a thriving area for reinforcement learning (RL) which have a long and mutually beneficial relationship (Szita, 2012). Evolution Chamber for example uses an evolutionary algorithm to find build-orders in the game of Starcraft 2. Temporal-difference learning, Monte Carlo learning and evolutionary RL (Wiering and Van Otterlo, 2012) are among the most popular techniques within the RL approach to games (Szita, 2012). Most RL research is based on the Markov decision process (MDP) that is a sequential decision making problem for fully observed worlds with the Markov property (Markov, 1960). Many RL techniques use MDPs as learning problems with stochastic nature; in multi-agent systems (Littman, 1994) the environment is also non-stationary.

As an alternative to RL, the AI opponents in today's games work mostly via finite state machines (FSMs) which cannot develop new strategies and are thus predictable. A higher difficulty is usually modelled by increasing gather-, attack- and hit-point modifiers of AI (Buro et al., 2007). The FSM behaviour is solely based on fixed state-transition tables. Therefore, in the past dynamic scripting has been proposed which can optimize performance and therefore the challenge (Spronck et al., 2006), but it is still dependent on a pre-programmed rule-base.

The real-time strategy (RTS) genre is a game played in real-time, where both players make moves simultaneously. Moves in RTS games can generally be seen as actions, such as move to a certain position, attack a specific unit, construct this building etc. These actions can be performed by units which are semi-autonomous agents. These agents come in different types with their own attributes and actions they can perform. The player can control all agents that are on his/her team via mouse and keyboard. The game environment is often seen from above with an angle that shows depth, and teams are indicated by colour.

The RTS genre is a particularly hard nut to crack for RL. In RTS games, the game-play consists of many different game-play components like resource gathering, unit building, scouting, planning and combat, which have to be handled in parallel in order to win (Marthi et al., 2005). In this paper we propose the use of hierarchical reinforcement learning (HRL) that allows RL to scale up to more complex problems (Barto and Mahadevan, 2003) to play an RTS game. Hierarchical reinforcement learning allows for a divide and conquer strategy (van Seijen et al., 2017), which significantly simplifies the learning problem. Towards the top of the hierarchy, the problem consist of selecting the best macro actions that take more than a single time step. The Semi-Markov decision process (SMDP) theory for HRL allows for actions

that last multiple time steps (Puterman, 1994).

Our RTS approach focusses on the sub-process of mid-level combat strategy. Neural network implementations of low-level combat behaviour have already shown reasonable results in (Patel, 2009; Buro and Churchill, 2012). Agents in the game of Counter Strike were given a single task and a neural network was used to optimize performance accomplishing this task. Our method uses task selection: instead of giving the neural network a single task for which it has to optimize, our neural network optimizes task selection for each unit. The unit then executes an order, like defend the base or attack that unit. The implementation of the behavior is executed via an FSM. Abstract actions reduce the state space and the number of time steps before rewards are received. The reduction is beneficial for RTS games due to the many options and the need for real-time decision-making.

For learning to play RTS games, we use HRL with a multi-layer perceptron (MLP). The combination of RL and MLP has already been successfully applied to game-playing agents (Ghory, 2004; Bom et al., 2013). RL and MLP have for example been successfully used to learn the combat behavior in Starcraft (Shantia et al., 2011). The MLP receives higher-order inputs, an approach where only a subset of (processed) inputs is used that has been successfully applied to improve speed and efficiency in the game Ms. Pac-man (Bom et al., 2013). Two RL methods, Q-learning and Monte Carlo learning (Sutton and Barto, 1998), are used to find optimal performance against a pre-programmed AI and a random AI. Since playing in an RTS game involves a multi-agent system, we compare two different methods for assigning rewards to individual agents: using individual rewards or sharing rewards by the entire team.

We developed a simple custom RTS where every aspect is controlled to reduce unwanted influences or effects. The game contains two bases, one for each team. A base spawns one of three types of units until it is destroyed, the goal of these units is to defend their own base and to destroy the enemy base. All decision-making components are handled by FSMs except for the component that assigns behaviours to units, and this is the subject of our research.

2 REAL-TIME STRATEGY GAME

The game is a simple custom RTS game that focuses on the mid-level combat behaviour. A lot of RTS game-play features such as building construction and resource gathering are omitted, while other aspects are controlled by FSMs and algorithms to reduce un-

wanted influences and effects. An example is the A* search algorithm which is used for path finding, while unit building is done by an FSM that builds the unit that counters the most enemies for which there is not a counter already present. A visual representation of the game can be found in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Visual representation of the custom RTS game.

The game consists of tiles; black tiles are walls and can't be moved through and white tiles are open space. The units can move in 4 directions. We use the Manhattan distance to determine the distance between 2 points. Although units do not step as large as a tile, our A* path finding algorithm computes a path from tile to tile for speed. When a unit is within a tile of the target, the unit moves directly towards it.

The goal of the game is to destroy the opponent's base and defend the own base. The bases are indicated by large blue and red squares in Figure 1. The game finishes when the hit-points of a base reach zero because of the units attacking it. Depending on the unit type a base has to be attacked at least 4 times before it is destroyed. The base is also the spawning point for new units of a team, the spawning time depends on the cool-down time of the previously produced unit.

There are three different types of units: archer, cavalry and spearman. Each unit has different statistics (stats) for attack, attack cool-down, hit-point, range, speed and spawning time. Spearmen are the default units with average stats. Archers have a ranged attack but move and attack speed is lowered. Cavalry units are fast and have high attack power but take longer to build. All units also have a multiplier that doubles their damage against one specific type. The archer has a multiplier against the spearman, the cavalry has a multiplier against the archer, and the spearman has a multiplier against the cavalry. This resembles a rock, paper, scissors mechanism, which is commonly applied in strategy games.

The most basic action performed by a unit is moving. Every frame, a unit can move up, down, left, right or stand still. If after moving, the unit is within attacking range of an enemy building or enemy unit, the unit deals damage to all the enemies that are in its range. The damage dealt is determined by the unit's attack

power and the unit-type multiplier. When a unit is damaged, its movement speed is halved for 25 frames (0.5s in real-time), which prevents units rushing the enemy base while enemy units cannot stop them in time. To make sure units do not die immediately they also have an attack cooldown after each attack, so that they cannot attack for a few turns after attacking.

2.1 Behaviours

The computer players do not directly control their units in our game, instead they give the units orders in the form of behaviours (goals). Four such behaviours are available: evasive invade, defensive invade, hunt and defend base. Units that are currently using a specific behaviour follow rules that correspond to that behaviour to determine their moves. All behaviours make use of an A* algorithm to either find the optimal paths to other assets/locations, or to compute the distance between locations. There is also an "idle" behaviour which means the unit does nothing. This behaviour is used when the unit is awaiting an order.

2.1.1 Defend Base

When starting the defend base behaviour, the unit selects a random location within 3 tiles of its base as its guard location such that not all guards stay at the same spot. If an enemy comes close to the base (within 3 tiles), the unit moves towards and attacks that enemy. If no enemies have come close to the base for 100 frames (2s in real time), the unit stops this behaviour, and goes to the idle state awaiting a new order. The pseudo-code can be found in Algorithm 1.

2.1.2 Evasive Invade

The unit takes a path to the enemy base that is at most a map length longer than the shortest path. The unit then chooses the path with the least enemy resistance of all the possible paths. While moving along the path, the unit also attacks everything in range including the enemy base hoping to find a weakness in the enemy defence and to exploit it. If the unit is damaged while in this behaviour, the unit returns to 'idle' until a new order is received. If the unit was damaged, the unit clearly failed to attack the enemy base while evading the enemy unit. This behaviour can be seen in the pseudo-code in Algorithm 2.

2.1.3 Defensive Invade

The unit takes a path to the enemy base that is at most a map length longer than the shortest path. The unit then chooses the path with the most enemy resistance

Algorithm 1: Defend Base.

```

if not within 3 tiles of the base then
    move back to own random guard location
else
    target = NULL
    for enemy in list of enemy units do
        distance=distance(base,enemy)
        if distance < minDistance then
            minDistance = distance
            target = enemy
        end if
    end for
    if target != NULL then
        move towards and attack target
    else
        move back to own random guard location
        if frame count > 100 then
            state = "idle"
        end if
    end if
end if

```

Algorithm 2: Evasive Invade.

```

if Damaged then
    state="idle"
    return
end if
lowest resistance= ∞
for path in find path to enemy base do
    if resistance < lowest resistance then
        lowest resistance = path resistance
        best path = path
    end if
end for
walk best path

```

of all the possible paths, to perform a counter attack on the strongest enemy front. After every step the unit attempts to attack everything around it. The idea here is to either destroy invading enemy units or at least slow them down, while still putting pressure on the enemy base defences. The behaviour does not default to the "idle" state since the termination condition is either the destruction of the enemy base or the death of the unit. The behavior is similar to the evasive invade behaviour and therefore we omitted its pseudo-code.

2.1.4 Hunt

The unit moves towards and attacks the closest enemy asset (enemy unit or base) it can find. The unit pursues the enemy asset until either it or the enemy asset is dead. If the enemy asset dies, the unit defaults back

Algorithm 3: Hunt.

```

if target=NULL then
  minDistance=∞
  for enemy in list of enemy assets do
    if enemy distance < distance then
      minDistance = enemy distance
      target = enemy
    end if
  end for
else
  if target health > 0 then
    find path to target
    walk path
  else
    target = NULL
    state = "idle"
  end if
end if

```

to an "idle" state, which is represented in Algorithm 3 by the target having 0 or less health.

3 HIERARCHICAL REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

In this section, we describe how we use reinforcement learning to teach the neural network how to play our RTS game. A reinforcement learning system consists of five parts, a model, an agent, actions, a reward function and a value function (Sutton and Barto, 1998). Here, the model is the game itself, our neural network is the agent, the policy determines how states are mapped to actions using the value function, the reward function defines rewards for specific states and finally the value function reflects the expected sum of future rewards for state-actions pairs. This value takes into account both short term rewards and future rewards. The goal of the agent is to reach states with high values. In most reinforcement learning systems it is assumed that future rewards can be predicted using only the information in the current state: past actions / history are not needed to make decisions. This is called the Markov property (Markov, 1960).

3.1 The Reward Function

The reward function is fixed and based on the zero-sum principle, points are distributed according to what would be prime objectives in RTS games: killing enemy units and destroying the enemy base which results in winning the game. The rewards are received the moment a unit destroys the enemy base or kills an

enemy unit. Dying or losing the game is punished, dying is not punished harsher than the reward for killing because units are expendable given that they at least take out 1 enemy unit before dying. The reward function for our RTS game can be found in Table 1. If multiple rewards are given while a specific behaviour is active they are simply summed and the total reward is taken as the reward for taking the chosen behaviour.

We created two different ways of distributing the rewards, individually and shared. For individual rewards the units get only the reward they caused themselves and so the only shared reward is the "Lose" reward. We assume that all units are responsible for losing. With shared rewards the moment a unit achieves a rewarding event all units from the same team get the reward. The exception here is that the step-reward is still only applied once per time-step to prevent extreme time-based punishments, when there are many units in the environment.

Table 1: List of events and their corresponding rewards.

Event	Reward	Description
Enemy killed	100	Unit has killed enemy unit
Died	-100	Unit died
Win	1000	Unit has destroyed the enemy base
Lose	-1000	The unit's base has been destroyed
Step	-1	Time step

3.2 The Exploration Strategy

We use the ϵ -greedy exploration strategy, this means that we choose the action with the highest state-action value all but ϵ of the time where $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$. In the cases ϵ -greedy does not act greedily, it will select a random behavior. We start with an ϵ of 0.2 and lower it over time to 0.02. We do this because intuitively the system knows very little in the beginning so it should explore, while over time the system should have more knowledge and therefore act more greedily.

3.3 Learning Strategies

From the various learning algorithms that can be used to learn the value-function, we have selected Q-learning and Monte Carlo methods (Sutton and Barto, 1998). From here on a state at time t is referred to as s_t and an action at time t as a_t . The total reward received after action a_t and before s_{t+1} is noted as r_t . The time that r_t spans can be arbitrarily long.

Monte Carlo methods implement a complete policy evaluation, this means that for every state we sum the rewards from that point onward, with a discount factor for future rewards, and use the total sum of discounted rewards to update the expected

reward of that state-action pair. The general Monte Carlo learning rule is:

$$Q(s_t, a_t) = Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \cdot (\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\lambda^i \cdot r_{t+i}) - Q(s_t, a_t))$$

Where α is the learning rate and λ the discount factor. The learning rate determines how strongly the value function is altered, while the discount factor determines how strongly future rewards are weakened compared to immediate rewards.

As opposed to Monte Carlo learning, Q-learning uses step by step evaluation. This means Q-learning uses the reward it gets after an action (can take arbitrary amount of time) and adds the current maximal expected future reward to determine how to update the action-value function. To get the expected future rewards the current value-function is used to evaluate the possible state-actions pairs. The general Q-learning rule is:

$$Q(s_t, a_t) = Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \cdot (r_t + \lambda \cdot \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a) - Q(s_t, a_t))$$

3.4 The Neural Network Component

The neural network contains one different output unit for every behavior, which represents the Q-value for selecting that behavior given the game input for that unit. For updating the network, we use the back-propagation algorithm where the target value of the previously selected behavior of a unit is given by one of our learning algorithms. The back-propagation algorithm takes a target for a specific input-action pair and then updates the network such that given the same input, the output is closer to the given target. When using RL, the target is given by a combination of the reward(s), discount factor and in case of Q-learning the value of the best next state-action pair. We use 3 different formulas to determine the target-value to train the neural network. The first function is used when this is the last behaviour of the unit, both learning methods share this formula:

$$T(s_t, a_t) = r_t$$

In other states Monte Carlo learning uses the following formula to determine the target-value:

$$T(s_t, a_t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\lambda^i \cdot r_{t+i})$$

While for Q-learning the following formula is used to determine the target-value:

$$T(s_t, a_t) = r_t + \lambda \cdot \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a)$$

Table 2: Inputs used to represent a state.

Unit specific inputs
Amount of hit-points left
Boolean (0 or 1) value "is spearman"
Boolean (0 or 1) value "is archer"
Boolean (0 or 1) value "is cavalry"
Minimal travel distance to enemy base
Minimal travel distance to own base
Resistance around the unit
Game specific inputs
Amount of defenders
Amount of attackers
Amount of hunters
Amount of enemy spearmen
Amount of enemy archers
Amount of enemy cavalry
Minimal travel distance between base and enemy unit

3.5 State Representation

The neural network does not directly perceive the game, and receives as input numeric variables that represent the game-state. These variables contain the most important information to make the best decisions. Including more information generally means deploying larger networks that make use of the information. Hence, the method would become slower and takes longer to train. The neural network receives 14 inputs, see Table 2. Half of the inputs are about the unit for which the behaviour has to be decided while the other half contains information about the current state of the game.

Unit specific inputs contain first of all basic information: the amount of hit-points the unit has left and which type it is (in the form of 3 boolean values). A unit also contains 2 inputs which give distance values namely the minimal travel distances to the enemy base and its own base. The final unit specific information contained in the inputs is the 'enemy resistance' around the unit, this counts all enemy units in a 5×5 square around the unit where the unit type it is strong against is counted as a half unit. Then the amount of friendly units in the same square is subtracted from this number. The result gives an indication how dangerous the current location is for the unit.

Game-wide inputs provide information about the owner of the units: the amount of defenders, attackers and hunters the owner already has. Note that for attackers the aggressive and evading invaders are summed. The inputs about the enemy contain the composition of the enemy army, so the amount of archers, cavalry and spearmen. This can be used to prevent for example hunting behaviour if the enemy has a lot of archers while the unit in question is a

spearman. Given that a spearman cannot perform ranged attack and is not very fast, the spearman would be taken out before achieving anything. The last input gives the distance between the owner's base and the enemy unit closest to it.

4 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

We compare our methods in all configurations: shared vs individual rewards, and Q-learning vs Monte Carlo methods.

4.1 Testing Setup

We test the algorithms against two pre-programmed opponents: 1) a random AI which simply chooses a random behaviour whenever it needs to make a decision, and 2) a classic AI which we programmed ourselves to follow a set of rules we thought to be logical. We also tested these two opponents against each other and found that they never tied and all games ended within 4500 frames. The classic AI wins about 46.5% of the games. Making a deterministic AI that plays well against the random AI as well as other opponents is quite difficult since the random AI is hard to predict, and countering the random AI specifically could result in the AI equivalent of over fitting where it wins from the random AI but loses from other opponents.

Each configuration has been ran for 100 trials where each trial is 26 epochs (games) long. Each initial neural network was stored on disk and after each game the network was again stored on disk. All stored networks were then tested for 40 games against the same AI opponent against which they were trained. During these 40 games, training and exploration is disabled to determine the network's performance. We then stored the win, lose and tie percentages. A tie is a game that is not finished after 4500 frames (90 seconds real-time).

The neural networks consist of 14 inputs and 4 outputs. After several parameter-sweeps for all configurations we found that the best performance was achieved with the following parameter settings. We used 2 hidden layers with layer sizes of 100 and 50 hidden units and a learning-rate which starts at 0.005 and that is multiplied with 0.7 after each game degrading to a minimum of 10^{-6} . The exploration rate also degrades from a start exploration rate of 20% to a final exploration rate of 2%. The discount factor is 0.9. Since most units have a relatively small amount of behaviours before dying we discount future rewards relatively harshly. Finally, we added momentum to the training algorithm of the neural network,

this means that the previous change of the network is used to adjust how the network should change. In our case 40% of the previous change is added to the current change of a weight in the network.

4.2 Results

The results that were gathered are plotted in Figures 2 - 5. Figure 2 and Figure 3 contain the mean ratio between wins and losses after X amount of epochs (games) for different combinations of learning algorithms and reward applications. Figure 2 shows the ratios of every configuration playing against the random AI, while Figure 3 shows the ratios for every configuration playing against the classic (pre-programmed) AI. The win-loss ratio shows how well the neural network performs in comparison to the opponent, a value of 1 represents equal performance. A value higher than 1 such as the Q-learning individual rewards result in Figure 2 represents better performance than the opponent, while a value lower than 1 represents worse performance than the opponent.




Figure 2: Graph that shows the ratio between wins and losses for all configurations against the random AI.




Figure 3: Graph that shows the ratio between wins and losses for all configurations against the classic AI.

Table 3: Mean performance after 26 epochs (games).

Opponent	Method	Reward Application	Win-rate	Tie-rate	Loss-rate	Win:loss
Classic	Q-learning	Individual	19.5%	75.0%	5.5%	7:2
Classic	Q-learning	Shared	13.2%	72.3%	14.4%	9:10
Classic	Monte Carlo method	Individual	18.0%	67.0%	15.0%	6:5
Classic	Monte Carlo method	Shared	21.9%	48.0%	30.0%	7:10
Random	Q-learning	Individual	28.6%	61.5%	10.0%	3:1
Random	Q-learning	Shared	23.5%	57.8%	18.8%	5:4
Random	Monte Carlo method	Individual	28.8%	45.1%	26.2%	11:10
Random	Monte Carlo method	Shared	32.0%	26.2%	41.9%	3:4




Figure 4: Graph that shows the summed ratios of wins and ties for all configurations against the random AI.




Figure 5: Graph that shows the summed ratios of wins and ties for all configurations against the classic AI.

The results shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5 contain the weighted sum of the mean win- and tie-rates for all different combinations of learning algorithms and reward applications. The win-rate has a weight of 1, loss-rate a weight of 0 and the tie-rate has a weight of 0.5. The lines indicate the mean weighted sum while the gray area indicates the standard deviation.

In all figures, all lines increase over time, meaning that all configurations improve their performance during training. One can clearly see that the combination of Q-learning with individual rewards outperforms all

other configurations significantly. After training, this method achieves a final win:loss ratio which is approximately 7:2 against the classic AI and 3:1 against the random AI, roughly 3 times higher than the second best configuration. The weighted sum of its win- and tie-rates are also significantly higher than all other combinations. It is noticeable that Q-learning outperforms Monte Carlo learning in both performance measures given that the other factors are equal and individual rewards outperforms shared rewards given the other factors are equal.

All the results measured show considerable tie-rates. Against the classic AI the tie-rates are mostly in the region of 65-75% and against the random AI they are mostly between 45-65% as shown in Table 3. The exceptions for both opponents are the results of Monte Carlo methods using a shared reward function, for which the tie-rate converges to around 50% against the classic AI, while the tie-rate converges to around 25% against the Random AI. This might seem favourable, but the decrease of the tie-rate has an almost one to one inverse relation with the loss-rate and is thus an overall worse result.

4.3 Discussion

The results show that individual rewards outperform shared rewards. We suspect the reason for this that predicting the sum of all future unit rewards is much harder for a unit than to learn to predict its own reward intake. Furthermore, Q-learning outperforms the Monte Carlo learning method. It is known that Monte Carlo methods have a higher variance in the updates, which makes the learning process harder.

The encountered relatively high tie-rates that were encountered in the measured results can be explained as follows. A round is deemed a tie when a time-limit of 90 seconds is reached. This feature is implemented to reduce stagnating behaviour and allow for faster data collection. Increasing the time limit should lower the amount of ties.

There are several facets which deserve a closer

look following our experiences during this research, especially the use of different modules and the multiplicative effects they can have. The unit builder is a great example. We found that having a more intelligent unit builder significantly improves performance. Even though the unit builder is now handled by an FSM, it implies that adding a module to the AI that can learn which units to build would likely increase the performance as a whole significantly. The result of a neural network using a smart unit builder (FSM) against our classic AI with a random unit builder can be observed in Figure 6. One can clearly see that the win-rate approaches 90%, which shows the importance of an intelligent unit builder for this game.




Figure 6: Graph of the performance for Q-learning with individual rewards where it has an improved unit building algorithm compared to the opponent's random choice.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We described several different reinforcement learning methods for learning to play a particular RTS game. The use of higher-order inputs and hierarchical reinforcement learning leads to a system which can learn to play the game within only 26 games. The results also show that Q-learning is better able to optimize the team strategy than Monte Carlo methods. For assigning rewards to individual agents, the use of individual rewards is better than sharing the rewards among all team members. This is most probably because predicting the intake of all shared rewards is difficult to learn for an agent given its own higher-level game representation as input to the multi-layer perceptron.

In future work, we would like to study the usefulness of more game-related input information in the decision making process of the agents. Furthermore, we want to use reinforcement learning techniques to not only learn the mid-level combat strategy, but also other tasks commonly present in an RTS game.

REFERENCES

- Barto, A. and Mahadevan, S. (2003). Recent advances in hierarchical reinforcement learning. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 13:341–379.
- Bom, L., Henken, R., and Wiering, M. (2013). Reinforcement learning to train Ms. Pac-Man using higher-order action-relative inputs. In *Adaptive Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning (ADPRL), 2013 IEEE Symposium on*, pages 156–163.
- Buro, M. and Churchill, D. (2012). Real-time strategy game competitions. *AI Magazine*, 33(3):106.
- Buro, M., Lanctot, M., and Orsten, S. (2007). The second annual real-time strategy game AI competition. *Proceedings of gameon NA*.
- Ghory, I. (2004). Reinforcement learning in board games. *Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol, Tech. Rep.*
- Littman, M. L. (1994). Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on machine learning*, volume 157, pages 157–163.
- Markov, A. A. (1960). The theory of algorithms. *Am. Math. Soc. Transl.*, 15:1–14.
- Marthi, B., Russell, S. J., Latham, D., and Guestrin, C. (2005). Concurrent hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *IJCAI*, pages 779–785.
- Patel, P. (2009). Improving computer game bots behavior using Q-learning. Master's thesis, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, San Diego.
- Puterman, M. L. (1994). Markov decision processes. 1994. *John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey*.
- Shantia, A., Begue, E., and Wiering, M. (2011). Connectionist reinforcement learning for intelligent unit micro management in Starcraft. In *Neural Networks (IJCNN), The 2011 International Joint Conference on*, pages 1794–1801. IEEE.
- Spronck, P., Ponsen, M., Sprinkhuizen-Kuyper, I., and Postma, E. (2006). Adaptive game AI with dynamic scripting. *Machine Learning*, 63(3):217–248.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (1998). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge.
- Szita, I. (2012). Reinforcement learning in games. In *Reinforcement Learning State-of-the-Art*, pages 539–577. Springer.
- van Seijen, H., Fatemi, M., Romoff, J., Laroché, R., Barnes, T., and Tsang, J. (2017). Hybrid reward architecture for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04208*.
- Wiering, M. and Van Otterlo, M. (2012). *Reinforcement Learning State-of-the-Art*, volume 12. Springer.